

OCT 04 1995

October 4, 1995

To: Lester Snow Fax (916) 654-9780  
From: Alex Hildebrand Fax (209) 825-6180  
Phone (209) 823-4166

Dear Lester:

This communication is to offer a few comments on the October 2 BDAC packet prior to the October workshop. My thoughts relate primarily to the Action Categories, but first a few comments on the Primary Problem/Objective Statement.

I believe the exotics are a more serious problem than indicated. They may be as serious as loss of benign habitat. I know of no determination that the total aquatic biomass in the Delta has diminished. It may be primarily altered rather than reduced. The biomass of my crops is shifted to weeds if I don't control the weeds and many of the weeds are exotics.

I believe that declining Delta inflow is a serious problem that must be addressed. Also, after the last full sentence on page 5 relating to seasonal reallocations of Delta inflow it should be added that seasonal reallocations can reduce water supplies for streamflow diverters in seasons of low streamflow.

The discussion of System Vulnerability does not mention BDOC's proposal that there be a financial and physical standby system for rapid repair of levee failures.

The list of examples of Action Categories should include new upstream water development to offset declining Delta inflow. Increased onstream storage often has far more potential for multipurpose benefits than offstream storage. For example, the USBR attests that the capacity of Millerton Lake behind Friant Dam could be very substantially increased. This would provide needed flood protection, would help restore the seriously degraded river water quality, would provide water yield for areas now importing Sacramento water, and would help provide newly mandated Delta inflow for fish.

It should be acknowledged that fish flows in the San Joaquin mainstem along the valley floor could be provided by circulating water from the DMC to the river and thence down to the Delta for recapture and return to the canal. This is a multiple use of water that is much less costly than providing new water or purchasing water from existing uses. The USBR has agreed to consider this.

The second sentence under Constraints to Installation of barriers should read "For example, a physical barrier at the head of Old River to keep San Joaquin River salmon from moving into Old River in the spring may block recreational navigation.

It also interferes with transport of flows important for water quality and channel water levels unless it is combined with tidal barriers in Middle River and in Old River just upstream of the CVP pumps.

The last sentence on the same page should be altered to read "-----and management of agricultural drainage that enters the river via Salt and Mud Sloughs to produce -----." It enters those sloughs by drainage from wetlands and agricultural lands in the CVP westside service area.

In regard to water reclamation, a constraint on its use is that it has increased salinity which can cause problems of salt disposal from areas of reuse, or increased groundwater salinity.

A constraint on water transfers is that transfers of tributary water from agricultural to other uses can result in loss of return flows to the stream system that are essential for downstream flow during summer months.

Sincerely,



Alex Hildebrand